

SOCIALISM versus ANARCHISM

by Daniel De Leon

Price 50 cents

Socialism Versus Anarchism

By *Daniel De Leon*

This is the text of an address delivered in Boston on Sunday, October 13, 1901, following the assassination of President McKinley. De Leon shows that the deed had nothing to do with Socialism. Instead, it was attributable to a philosophy inherent in class-ruled society—the belief, natural enough in a less complex society, that an individual act can change the course of history, and that the people do not count. De Leon also shows that this belief is most prominently held by the Roman Catholic political machine, and that virtually all the assassins of rulers in modern history were the product of that machine. In developing his theme, De Leon disposes of the “chessboard theory of history,” demonstrates that the masses do count and proves the validity of the Marxian, or materialist, conception of history.

The pamphlet also contains Paul Lafargue’s “The Police and the Anarchists,” which illustrates the capitalist use of anarchists as a weapon against Socialism. An addendum, “Socialist Industrial Unionism,” outlines the program of Socialism.

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS

116 Nassau St., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

*

The New York Labor News, publishing department of the Socialist Labor Party, publishes equally sound literature on other subjects touching on the social question. Send for a free catalogue.

Socialism

Versus

Anarchism

An Address

By DANIEL DE LEON

We have moved
Address mail to:
P.O. Box 70517
Sunnyvale, CA 94086-0517

1970

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS
116 Nassau St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201



Preface

In its preface to the 1919 edition of Daniel De Leon's address on "Socialism Versus Anarchism," the National Executive Committee of the SLP said:

"'Socialism Versus Anarchism' is one of those little gems of lecturing art, delivered upon 'an occasion,' which time inevitably makes a classic. The occasion which brought forth this pronouncement by the Socialist Labor Party through Daniel De Leon was the assassination of President William McKinley at Buffalo, N. Y., by the anarchist [Leon] Czolgosz. [McKinley was shot Sept. 6, 1901, and died Sept. 14.] The assassination of McKinley caused a veritable outburst of blind rage and petty persecution against individuals and organizations which professed to any kind of so-called radical 'ism.' Open or covert attacks were made upon the Socialist movement, with that unerring class instinct which makes the ruling class and its henchmen scent in Socialism its real opponent and take every opportunity to attack it with the fervent though futile hope of wiping it out of existence. Outrages, by mobs or petty authorities, were committed against Socialists under the belief, real or assumed, that Socialists were anarchists. Public outrages were stimulated and abetted by the capitalist press, which in every city and state, in its usual glib, ignorant, or willfully vicious fashion, confounded anarchism with Socialism as if the two were identical and synonymous.

"The Socialist Labor Party, the true representative of the Socialist movement in America, saw itself compelled to make a plain and authoritative statement

First edition, 1901; unrecorded editions between 1901 and 1919. New edition, with special preface, 1919. Reprinted, 1921

Amplified edition, with Lafargue essay and Socialist Industrial Unionism statement, and additional footnotes, all new type, January, 1962; December, 1970

(Printed in the United States of America)

showing the difference between anarchism and Socialism both in theory and practice. Section Boston of the Socialist Labor Party arranged a mass meeting with Daniel De Leon as the speaker. In his usual calm and logical manner, De Leon traced the doctrine of 'physical force,' the so-called 'propaganda of the deed,' to its last conclusion, showing that it played its role in history at an age when the individual, the leader, the king, the emperor, or whatever the one-man ruler might be called, was all, and the mass counted for nothing; showing how this 'revolutionary method,' outgrown and outworn at this time, has stuck in the human conception to this day, theoretically fostered by that one organization—the Catholic Church—in which the Pope or the priest, that is to say, the individual leader, still counts for all and the mass counts for less than nothing; showing the stupidity, the futility in our day and age, of the methods and the tactics of the anarchists; and showing, furthermore, how diametrically opposite to these are the methods and tactics of the Socialist Labor Party."

Anarchism in its various manifestations is still useful to capitalism for lying about Marxian Socialism. And there have been other "bogeys." Following World War I, it was "Bolshevism"; today, it is "Communism." The "Communism" bogey is, of course, particularly pernicious because of the perilous state of the world and specifically because of the tensions arising out of the imperialist struggle between Western capitalism and Soviet bureaucratic despotism. The bureaucratic masters of Soviet Russia claim to be "Communists," and "Marxists," and the capitalists attempt to use this claim to discredit Marxism among their own wage slaves. The truth is that Soviet Russia has betrayed every principle that Marx stood for and has,

in the name of Marx, created a system in which the workers are exploited by the State which owns and administers the entire economy and which, in turn, is controlled by a class of privileged bureaucrats.

In the sense in which Karl Marx and Frederick Engels used the terms, "Communism" and "Socialism" are synonymous. Both stand for a classless, Stateless society in which the means of social production are owned socially and administered democratically by the workers in the interest of all the people. But in the sense in which "Communism" is popularly construed today, that is, as descriptive of the Soviet system, it is the very antithesis of Socialism.

De Leon's speech, although designed to serve an immediate purpose, is immensely instructive today for the light it throws on the evolution of society, and on the lofty character and philosophy of Socialism. Thus De Leon shows how vital it is that the "revolution" first take place in the minds of the workers. "The initial revolution must be accomplished in your minds," he said. "You must have divorced yourselves from the habits of thought that have been used to your enslavement; you must have come to an understanding that you are the sole producers of all wealth. . . . you must have raised yourselves to appreciate your high mission in the evolution of society, in that only the economic program of your class is about to abolish the slavery of the race."

Ironically, yet logically, although the charge of anarchy against Socialism is a false charge, easily proven to be false, the same charge against capitalism, and specifically against the capitalist economic system, has obvious validity. The whole competitive system is anarchistic. It has made of society a veritable economic jungle in which the potentialities of abundance for all,

which inhere in modern means of social production, are crushed in a raw-boned struggle for private capitalist advantage.

Following the speech itself, there were questions and answers which we include in this edition. Apart from the interest De Leon's answers to questions from the floor awaken in the reader, they constitute remarkable evidence of his profoundly logical mind, and of his ability to apply fundamental principles on the spur of the moment.

The Speech

Ladies and Gentlemen: The voices of those little ones¹ induce me to introduce my own introduction with an observation of Victor Hugo's. On a certain occasion, when the French Revolution seemed to be in danger (and you understand by the French Revolution not the decapitation of anybody, but the overthrow of the feudal system), more than one is said to have gathered courage from hearing, while walking the streets of Paris, the little children singing "Ca Ira" ("It will succeed"). Victor Hugo, in his own peculiar language, said on the subject: "The voices of those children, that is the voice of the immense future." It matters not whether these children are aware that a Socialist Labor Party meeting is being held here or not. Let us take it as a good omen that the voices of these little ones echo, outside of this hall, the cheers that, inside, have greeted the introduction of a Socialist Labor Party speaker. (Applause.)

Before taking up my subject, allow me to make a few introductory remarks, which may, or may not, be necessary in this instance; or may be necessary only to a very limited extent; or possibly may be necessary to a very extended extent.

All those of you who remember the recent vulgar attacks upon the Socialist Labor Party on the part of the Republican press, which manufactured "Socialists,"

¹After the applause had subsided in the hall, the speaker, before starting again, was compelled to wait until the noise raised by some urchins on the street had stopped, who, hearing the cheering in the hall, took it up and kept at it for a few seconds.

and put into their mouths cheers for the assassin of McKinley; all those of you who remember the equally obscene assaults by the Democratic press, which endeavored to connect Czolgosz directly with the Socialist Labor Party; all those of you who recollect the vulgar language hurled from the Protestant and Jewish pulpits, lumping Socialism and anarchism in one; all those of you who remember the immoral attitude struck by the princes of the Roman Catholic hierarchy of this country, who, forgetful of their claim that they are "teachers of morality," have, on the occasion of the Buffalo tragedy, resorted to the immoral act of falsifying the tenets and principles of Socialism; all those of you who remember the language of the politicians, Democratic and Republican, on this subject, may possibly expect of me that I am going, this afternoon, to hit back. Nothing of the sort. The sun hits not back against the dark clouds that may gather in its face; neither does the Socialist Labor Party.

The Socialist Labor Party, like all truth, can bide its time; and in the meantime proceed serenely along its way. To hit back increases disorder because it increases animosity. I come not to hit back. What I come for is to enable those gathered here—to the extent that I can within the limited time that is physically possible for a person to address you on so broad a question—to pick their own way; to give you tips, as it were, that may aid you in unraveling the complicated problem that this question of anarchism brings up, that the shot of Czolgosz has raised into prominence.

Indeed, the great social question cannot be entered, perhaps, by a better gate than the gate which not anarchism suggests, but which the anarchistic forces of society try to raise as a barrier against the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist movement.

The social question has been justly called the great solvent, that great ocean, into which all rivers of knowledge flow, and to which all the departments of intellectual upbuilding are tributaries. It is hard to say that this, that, or the other of the numerous sub-questions is the most important. I shall not say that the questions raised in the public mind by the word anarchism are the most important; but what I do maintain is this: That this question involves a tactical issue; and that that tactical issue is today of the greatest importance.

With these preliminary remarks I shall begin, but first I must bring in another little preliminary. It is suggested by a book review in one of the New York papers of this very morning. At the risk of advertising a very stupid book, and a still more stupid reviewer, I shall mention their names. I hold here the New York *Sun* of this morning. It contains a certain book review. The author of the book is a gentleman who has perpetrated works of this nature before. His name is John Rae. He has written a book called "The History of Socialism." God help Socialism and God help history! (Laughter and applause.) I have marked and picked out of this review three of the statements which the reviewer has taken and dishes up as choice morsels from Mr. Rae's book. These passages will serve me as landmarks during my address to you and will help me to make clear my argument. Let me read them.

The first is: Mr. Rae characterizes anarchism as "the latest and most misshapen offspring of revolutionary opinion." I shall show you that anarchism is not the latest, but, so far from being the latest, is the very oldest conception of a revolutionary movement. I shall show you that it is old, stale, and played out. (Laughter and applause.) I shall show you that it is the child

of infant social organization. I shall show you that whatever manifestation of it we have today is purely an atavistic revival of an old, old idea.

The next statement that I think of importance to quote is this: He says: "The anarchists of Boston," and I quote it because you are of Boston, "for example, are individualists; one of the two groups of English anarchists in London is individualist"; and Mr. Rae (reading from the review) points out that these individualist anarchists are very few in number anywhere, and he maintains that the mass of the party whose deeds excite abhorrence on both sides of the Atlantic are undoubtedly more socialistic than the Socialists themselves." I shall show you that he who connects anarchism with Socialism commits in the domain of sociology as great a blunder as he who, in the domain of natural science, would say that the eagle belongs to the same species as the eel in the zoological scale.

The last clause in the analysis of Mr. Rae's book by this reviewer that helps me out and that I shall quote is this: He says: "It is said to be a subject of speculative discussion among the anarchists whether two members are sufficient to constitute an anarchist club. The dread of subjection to authority keeps them disunited and weak. A small group may concoct an isolated crime, but it can do little toward bringing about a social revolution."

Mind you, this is the opinion of the author, condensed by the reviewer, and is given as a pearl of thought. I shall show you that the man who wrote that does not know the first thing about history. I shall show you that these individualistic outbreaks have accomplished wonderful revolutions in their time, but in days gone by. I shall show you that, as humanity progresses, individual acts wane in strength, and I shall

show you why, today, they are simply flashes in the pan; consequently that this wholesale denunciation of individualistic revolutions, individualistic shots and individualistic assassinations, as acts incapable of accomplishing great results, shows that these gentlemen have no conception of what anarchism really means, or where it has its roots.

ANARCHISM AND ASSASSINATION

Now to the subject. Of course, whatever makes much noise is considered by the superficial observer as the thing. Now, particularly, with anarchism, the noisy part of anarchism is not the essence of anarchism. One anarchist who fires a shot, one anarchist who throws a dynamite bomb, or one anarchist who today assassinates a President, has his name flashed from one end of the country to the other to such an extent that people, who are themselves itching for notoriety, are so envious of him that they pass resolutions declaring that his name shall not hereafter be mentioned at all. Assassination is not an essential part of anarchism.

You get assassination as a possible, but by no means an inevitable, incident of anarchism. Anarchism does not imply homicide, however natural its development in that direction may seem. Anarchism is essentially a gubernatorial or governmental conception — a conception of government in social society.

A conception of government is a reflex of social conception; and that social conception in its turn is based upon, not what we would like, or what we would fancy to be the desirable thing, but upon what material conditions dictate. You take your present raspingly noisy and unseemly elevated in Boston, for instance; it is not what you would like; but it is a reflex of the conditions of things and capabilities of the time; and

that reflex takes tangible form in the best way people know and are physically able to meet a certain condition of things.

Now, what is the social conception that lies at the root of anarchism? I can hardly illustrate Socialism better than by drawing clear the essence of anarchism. With that as a background, then Socialism, the reason therefor, what it means and the tactics to reach it, spring naturally to the eye.

ANARCHISM'S CONCEPT OF GOVERNMENT

What, then, is that governmental conception that manifests itself as anarchism? What that social conception is the reflex of, I shall not start with stating. I shall mention some leading historic events, and thus enable you to answer the questions yourselves.

Take one of the leading epochs in ancient history. We there come across a monumental being. His name has come down to our days; he has given names to cities; his sayings, his words, his conduct, have become proverbial. That man was Alexander, named the Great. He built an empire that lapped over both sides of the Euxine [Black Sea]; he conquered the formerly unconquerable Greeks; he spread eastward over the great empires of the Assyrians and Babylonians, or whatever names they had. His empire swamped Egypt, and raised the city of Alexandria, with all that it implied. That empire was the largest empire, properly speaking, using the word in a semi-technical sense, the largest the world had yet seen. Alexander was its head.

One day, Alexander died. What became of his empire? Immediately upon his death, it shattered into a dozen different fragments. Without Alexander the empire of Alexander came to naught. The death of that

man was not brought on by homicide. His death is attributed to "a natural event in the course of nature." The fact that interests us most just now is what happened when that great Alexander died. What happened was the death of his empire. Leave that as one instance.

Now let us take up another series of events. It is one less palatable than the one just mentioned to the Jewish rabbis, the Protestant and Catholic pulpiteers whom I referred to in opening. But that is not my fault; it is theirs. The series of events which I now propose to mention is taken from the Bible. You know that the elect of the Lord backslid very frequently. On one of these occasions they fell under the control of a wicked race called the Moabites. Thereupon they groaned under the yoke of the Moabites many long years.

Finally, in the language of the Bible, "God raised up a judge to Israel." His name was Ehud. He looked around, and saw the oppression of his nation, and made up his mind to put an end to the oppressors. How did he go about it? By warring against the Moabites? No. The king of the Moabites was a gentleman by the name of Eglon, described as "a very fat man." Ehud, who is described as "left-handed," provided himself with a dagger; hid it under his garment; secured a private interview with Eglon, who was thrown off his guard seeing Ehud's right hand unarmed; and, suddenly using his left hand, grasped his dagger, and, in the language of the Bible, "thrust it into Eglon's belly," so that "the haft went in after the blade, and the fat closed upon the blade" and stuck fast.

Exit Eglon, not alone, but every mother's son of the Moabite oppressors. With the death of King Eglon the rule of the Moabites was at an end as absolutely as if Ehud's dagger had transfixed every single Moabite in transfixing Eglon. That much for the claim of the review I have read from, that individualistic acts are barren of results.

Take another event, also from the Bible. It is a celebrated one, one that has passed into art, furnishing poets and painters with the subject for many a great production. It is the story of Judith and Holofernes.

King Nebuchadnezzar, as he is called in the Book of Judith, allowed his eyes to roam around, and caught sight of the Jews, and decided to conquer them. Holofernes was appointed the general of that conquering army. He carried everything before him, and finally reached Judea with an army over a hundred thousand strong. With that he encamped near Bethulia. The Jews were hard pressed; the water had been turned away from them; talk of surrender began to be heard.

At that critical moment a woman stepped forth. She consulted no one; she confided her plan to no one, not even to the maid servant that she took along. She arrayed herself at her best, and sallied forth from the city toward the camp of Holofernes, before whose tent she soon arrived, the soldiers readily making way for her. In the beautiful language of the Bible, as near as I can recall it, "her sandals ravished his senses, and her countenance took his mind prisoner."

To make a long story short, one night, as Holofernes lay in the stupor of sleep on his couch, Judith took

his falchion, cut off his head, and returned home with it. The decapitation of Holofernes was equivalent to the decapitation of every individual in his vast army. That army vanished as completely as the first thin layer of snow vanishes on the streets of New York when struck by the torrid sun of southern Europe; it vanished even more completely, leaving not a wrack behind.

This was a great result. It put off for many a hundred years the day when the fiat of time was to be recorded, and the Roman emperor placed upon the ramparts of Jerusalem the stone effigy of a pig with impudently curled tail as the seal of Gentile subjugation of the Jewish Acropolis. A more "autonomous" or "individualistic" act can ill be conceived; nor one more fruitful of result.

CAPTURE PARIS AND YOU'VE TAKEN FRANCE

Let us now take a long leap forward into modern history. You have watched contemporaneous events in France. "Paris," down to a very recent date, stood for "France." In the successive crises witnessed in that country, whatever coterie of capitalist interests captured Paris captured France "for good measure." And Paris stood for "the government." Whoever took the government had the nation.

Draw nearer to our own country. What is the spectacle presented on this head by our neighbor republic, Mexico? The railroads have in more recent date taken from revolutions the chance of success they once enjoyed. But until then, how stood it? The chieftain, or, say, the interests clustered around such a chief, who aimed at controlling the people, simply marched upon the capital. "The capital" stood for "the government."

He who pocketed the government bagged the people.

And finally, stepping upon our own soil, and coming down to the immediate present, what is the spectacle that is being presented just now in our Empire City of Greater New York? A fierce municipal campaign is raging there between the forces of capitalism, aligned along the lines of Fusion or "reform," on the one side, and the party in power, Tammany Hall, on the other.

What is it all about? Corruption — undeniable, openly admitted or silently conceded — is rampant in the municipal government. Do the "reform" forces, with Seth Low² as their fuleman, take the people of the city into account? Do they recognize that the precariousness of livelihood among the toiling masses, the racking nervous strain to "keep up appearances" among the shoddycracy, the slipperiness of the foundation of their affluence among the plutocracy; do they take into consideration that these popular conditions necessarily breed an atmosphere of social impurity, whose exhalations are bound to manifest themselves in governmental impurity and corruption?

Not in the slightest! The Seth Low column of fused Republican and Democratic capitalists—granting for the nonce the honesty of their declamations—proceeds from the principle that it is all-sufficient to decapitate

²Seth Low, capitalist and former president of Columbia University, was elected reform Mayor of New York City in 1902. His "Fusion" party (Republicans plus some "good government" Democrats) administration was succeeded in time by that of Fiorello LaGuardia, who served as Mayor from 1934 to 1945. Tammany continued to thrive and has been in the saddle ever since. The capitalists may have saved on taxes during the reform administrations, but the workers were unaffected one way or the other by "good government."

Tammany Hall with the falchion of a "reform government" in order to establish governmental purity; with the decapitation of Tammany Hall it is expected that impurity and corruption in the city will have been decapitated; ayé, decapitated as effectively as the empire of Alexander the Great died when he died; as effectively as the Moabite oppressors of the Jews were stabbed to death by the dagger with which Ehud stabbed to death the Moabite king; as effectively as the hundred and odd thousand soldiers of Holofernes were beheaded with the falchion with which Judith cut off their general's head; as effectively as the France of the first half of this century was successively captured by the successive revolutions that captured Paris; as effectively as the Mexican people were bagged by the chieftains who pocketed the capital of the Republic; mark you, as effectively, and upon the same principle, as the shot of the anarchist Czolgosz was expected by him to kill capitalist domination by the killing of the President of the nation. [Applause.]

CHESSBOARD CONCEPT OF SOCIETY

No need of multiplying examples. The mental kinship of all these instances is obvious. From them leaps to view the identical governmental conception together with the social conception of which it is the reflex. And what is that? It is obviously the social conception that the people do not count in society, except, at best, as food for cannon [laughter and applause]; that government, accordingly, is something outside of, separate and apart from, and superimposed upon the people from above.

It is the chessboard conception of society. One may

have all his men on the board, but if his king is checkmated, the game is lost. Your opponent may have pawns, bishops, knights, rooks and queen, but if you have crowded his king to where he must surrender, then all his bishops, his pawns, his rooks, his knights, and even his queen, go for naught. And that conception is the essence of anarchism. [Cheers and applause.] All else in anarchism are but incidents and results that flow from this central principle. [Applause.]

Now, then, as you may begin to perceive, this anarchist conception of society and of government was natural enough, and in place, at a certain social stage. How much in place, and what sort of social stage, you may have an inkling of from the illustration furnished by Alexander's empire, and from the effectiveness with which that conception of society was applied in the instances of Ehud and Judith, together with many other instances that these two readily suggest.

On the other hand, from the other instances cited, and the many more you can readily think of, together with the common experience of the declining effectiveness with which that anarchist conception of society is applied down to our own days, when its application regularly suffers shipwreck, as illustrated by the utter failure that attends and must inevitably attend all the "purity movements" that we have seen spring up periodically in the land; from all this it will be clear that, from the social conditions in Asia Minor and Palestine, many centuries before Christ, to those of the United States in the twentieth century; from the days of Ehud and Judith to those of Czolgosz and Seth Low [laughter and applause], a steady change has been going on, until, today, the old anarchist conception of gov-

ernment no longer fits with actual social conditions. [Applause.]

Now, then, what is the reason the Ehuds and Judiths succeeded, while, today, the Czolgoszes and Lows have failed, and will continue to fail? Before going to the bottom of the matter, and detailing the fundamental and remote, it is well first to point out the immediate reason.

The immediate reason is a sociological development pregnant with significance. It is this: For reasons that I shall presently take up more fully, the masses are stepping more and more upon the stage of history, and not as "supers" or scene-shifters, but as stars in the performance. [Applause.] They counted for naught—except as "supers" and scene-shifters—under the industrial order when Ehud and Judith figured.

They gradually begin to count for more and more; the history of the principalities of northern Italy and the Hansa towns of Germany is interesting reading on the early stages of this transformation.

Under the modern industrial order, the masses have grown into society. And not a few of the epileptic fits that capitalist society is being continually thrown into are the result of the attempt on the part of the capitalist class to ignore, while seeking to profit by, the change; they are the result of the efforts of that class to brace itself against the Niagara-like torrent of evolution that has removed government down and away from the skies and planted it on earth, and that marks it flesh of the people's flesh, and bone of their bone, part and parcel of, inseparable from, society. [Applause.]

The further back one traces the race, the fewer are

concerned in the government; the fewer are so concerned, the more natural, because the easiest, is the system of effecting changes—aye, improvements—by “dispatching” the government.

The further we move forward, the more intimate becomes the blending of “government” with the rest of society; in even step the system of “dispatching” a government, whether by assassination or some newer method, grows more barren in results: To the Red Terror ever succeeds the White; the individually benign McKinley is succeeded by the Spiked-Police-Club Roosevelt.³ [Applause.]

The anarchist conception of government and modern social conditions is not the least of the glaring contradictions that capitalist-ruled society groans under. It fomenters civilization, and yet it incites to barbarism.

It is no accident, for instance, that Balthasar Gerard, the assassin of William the Silent, a leader in the Protestant Revolution (there is an interesting historic event in this connection that I hope I may remember or have time to touch upon later); that Jacques Clement, the assassin of Henry III of France; that Ravallac, the assassin of Henry IV, also of France; and, coming down to the history of our own days, that Kullman, the would-be assassin of Bismarck; Santos, the assassin of President Carnot of France; Bresci, the assassin of King Humbert of Italy; Luechini, the assassin of the Empress of Austria; Algoncillo, the assassin of the Spanish Prime Minister Canovas del

³Theodore Roosevelt, former New York Police Commissioner, then Governor of New York State, and then President. As Police Commissioner, Roosevelt advocated the use of spiked police clubs.

Castillo; it is no accident that all of these, down to Czolgosz, were Catholics.⁴

It is no accident that these were all brought up by the Roman Catholic hierarchy during the tender years which that same hierarchy recognizes as the most important in shaping the future man's mind. I say it is no accident. Not, indeed, that the Roman Catholic hierarchy makes it a practice of preaching assassination; not that. But that—unable, as it would seem, to free itself from its patriarchal and subsequent feudal habits, and becoming in our days the handmaid of the capitalist system of despotism—it instills into its pupils, not the today true and elevating principle that government is a reflex of social conditions, but the today false and degrading theory that social conditions are a reflex of government: a theory that by exaggerating the value of the individual act, by thus inflating the individual

⁴ Jacques Clement, the assassin of Henry III, was a Dominican friar. His deed was encouraged by the Catholic League of France. The Encyclopedia Britannica notes that the murderer was “regarded as a martyr and extolled by Pope Sixtus V, while even his canonization was discussed.” Ravallac, the killer of Henry IV, wanted to become a Jesuit. The Jesuits were the theological defenders of political murder, notably in the works of the Spanish Jesuits, Juan de Mariana and Francisco Suarez. In a biography of Suarez, an American Jesuit summarized Suarez’ justifications of murder and concluded: “. . . no private person can take to himself the right to slay the king unless he were commissioned by the community or its lawful representatives [the Catholic League, for example]. He will then be acting in the name of the State and on public authority. Likewise, when the [murder] sentence has been imposed by the Pontiff [the Pope], the deposition and slaying can be achieved only by the person, or persons, appointed by him.” (“Man of Spain,” by Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., bearing the “Imprimatur” — “It may be printed” — of Cardinal Spellman, and published by Macmillan, 1940.)

self-love, needs but to fall upon favorable soil to inevitably breed the assassin. [Prolonged applause.]

A great woman, George Eliot, has called the attention of the race to the following principle of investigation: The important thing is not to find that in which things, seemingly alike, are unlike; the important thing is to ascertain that which things seemingly unlike have in common, or are alike in.

The naturalist has proceeded on these lines. In establishing, for instance, the cardinal point of contact between a huge elephant and the wee little mouse, the domain of natural philosophy was immensely enlarged, and no slight insight was gained into the scheme of nature.

And the naturalist has pursued this line further. He has not rested content with the examination of the large types only, after taking up such large formations as the elephant, the rhinoceros, the giraffe, etc., he turned his attention to the minute insect; and rich is the store of information thereby garnered.

The interrelation of animal life thus ascertained has been invaluable in the comprehension of life and evolution. I wish in this study of anarchism to proceed upon the same lines. My investigation, so far, was confined to such huge formations as the Republican party, the Democratic party, the capitalist reformers, together with their Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant clerical varieties. These are all like elephants, rhinoceroses, giraffes, etc., in the sociologic menagerie of anarchism. I now want to descend to the insect world of the same family. It will materially help to round up our information.

ANOTHER VARIETY OF ANARCHIST

There is in the political domain of this country an insect known as "Kangaroo Social Democracy."⁵ [Laughter and applause.] Let us take a pin; let us stick that pin into that insect; let us hold it up and examine it. We shall find a striking connection between it and the elephant-like, rhinoceros-like, giraffe-like anarchist creatures we have been sticking the scalpel into. [Applause.]

You will—all of you who are at all informed—agree with me that the golden dream of the Kangaroo Social Democracy is to capture the Socialist Labor Party. The mere existence; the posture; the activity; the high grade vitality; the mental, moral, and physical fiber of the Socialist Labor Party have been a veritable nightmare to the Kangaroo Social Democracy, to such a point that the Socialist Labor Party actually deprives the insect of all equipoise. The Kangaroo Social Democracy wishes fervently to capture, and, if it cannot do that, to kill the Socialist Labor Party.

With this end in view, what is the plan of campaign that the insect has adopted and pursues? Has it been to work upon and win over the Socialist Labor Party members, or kill off *them*? No! All of you, approximately informed upon the subject, will agree that the plan the insect adopted and pursues was, which?—to

⁵ The reference is to an element originally in the Socialist Labor Party who, in defense of capitalist unionism, attempted to capture the S.L.P. Failing in this, the "kangaroos"—so named by De Leon after the "kangaroo courts" of Civil War times—jumped (like their prototypes) to safety when exposed into the Social Democratic party, which furnished the basis for the so-called Socialist party.

kill off the Editor of THE PEOPLE! [Laughter and applause.] Look at what passes for "literature" in their camp, and is issued as such by them; look at the word of mouth "agitation" they carry on. There is no capitalist class to be fought, no wage slavery to be overthrown; there is only one "wicked man" to be killed off—the Editor of THE PEOPLE. [Laughter.]

Whatever calumny could do, whatever chicanery could do, whatever backbiting could do, whatever malicious forgery could do, the insect has resorted to, with a view to killing off that one man, to whom it attributes headship in the Socialist Labor Party. In other words: the Kangaroo Social Democracy has acted obedient to the same notion that guided the Ehuds of old, and that guides the Czolgoszes and Lows of today; to wit, the anarchist notion that by killing off an officer supposed to be clothed with headship, his organization is killed along with him, or falls a helpless booty into the hands of his slayer. [Applause.] In other words, the anarchist tactics of the Kangaroo Social Democracy betray its anarchist conception of organization, and brand it anarchist. [Applause.]

The Socialist Labor Party is an organization of the twentieth century, and of twentieth century conditions. No man makes the Socialist Labor Party. [Applause.] It is the Socialist Labor Party that makes its men. And the truth hereof is exemplified at every turn by the shipwreck that attends every anarchist attempt upon the sane, broad, practical, and unflinching democracy of the Socialist Labor Party. [Applause.] Its officers have not dropped down into their positions from the

sky. They are a product of the organization. [Applause.] Vain, because anarchistic, is the imagining of anyone who, aiming at capturing or killing off the organization, merely aims at capturing or killing off its officers. He who aims at capturing or killing off the Socialist Labor Party must address himself to the task of capturing or killing off the Socialist Labor Party itself. [Loud applause and cheers.]

Now, if you have followed me so far, looking from one end to the other end of the gamut—from the basso profundo of the Democratic party and the Republican party up to the Catholic hierarchy and the Jewish and Protestant pulpits, till you finally reach the penny-whistle treble of the Social Democracy—you will find written over all their faces, as clear as it is possible for a man to see who has eyes to see — *anarchism*. [Loud applause.] Anarchism backward; anarchism forward.

THE SOCIAL FORCE OF THE MASSES

The difference between these and the outspoken anarchists—in that the former imagine conditions can be changed by the mere capturing of governments, while the latter hold that conditions can be changed by the mere decapitations of governments—is a difference, not of kind, but of variety. They both belong to the same species, the mark of which is that conception of government—correct at one time, rendered less so from social cycle to social cycle until today it is preposterous—that consists in holding that government is something outside, separate and apart from the people. [Applause.]

Now, against that conception the Socialist Labor

Party stands out alone in the United States. It says today, at the present stage of civilization, there is no reform worth speaking of that is possible by simply monkeying with the government. You must educate the masses first. [Applause.] You cannot move faster than the masses move with you in this twentieth century. Aye, even in Russia the masses have a good deal to say. In some countries they are active forces, in other countries, passive forces; but forces, social forces, they have become all the same.

Consequently the Socialist Labor Party cannot preach in one place a doctrine that it denies in another place; it cannot preach a doctrine in one place that is based upon one theory, and in another, preach the same doctrine, backing it up by another theory; in other words, it cannot play the role of a double-faced siren, and indulge in the practices that one and all of the organizations—clerical and lay—which I have mentioned indulge in. You must take the individual and revolutionize him. The revolutionizing of the individual develops the necessary head which society requires to progress.

I think it was from this very platform that, a few years ago, in an address entitled "Reform or Revolution," I treated this matter in detail. To run rapidly over the principles there laid down, they were as follows:

Under the social system where the tool of production is so small that every single man can operate it himself, he, under that social system, owns his tool, and, along with that, owns the product of his toil. If he started without implements of labor, he could easily

acquire them. He was the architect of his own fortune. Production at that stage had not a few satisfactory features; it had, however, a very unsatisfactory one. The individual producer could not produce enough to free himself from that animal condition of having to grub for his material sustenance all his life. Man aspires to freedom from the necessity of worrying as to how he will live, or whether he will enjoy shelter. Man's ambition is to be free from that; and the potentiality of his freedom in that direction increases in even step with the perfection of the implements of labor.

Hand in hand with this development goes another. The more perfect the tool of production becomes, the more are men compelled to cooperate in production. I am almost tempted to have that blackboard brought forward to prove the point. It is a point almost subject to mathematical demonstration. Cooperation is the topnotch flower of improved machinery. Cooperation brings about a multiplication of the fruitfulness of labor many times more than the amount the individual could raise. If ten men produce a certain quantity individually, under the cooperative labor superinduced by the modern perfected machine they would produce, not ten times as much, but a hundred times more.

However free man may be, there are things he cannot rise above. He cannot rise above material evolution. He would like to fly to San Francisco to reach a sick friend's bedside, but he is compelled to submit to his physical inability to go any faster than inventive

science makes it possible.⁶ Man is compelled to cooperate, so that the productivity of labor shall be so large that he can enjoy leisure and develop himself intellectually.

In Massachusetts, old-time farming, individual farming, was self-supporting after a style. The father plowed, and carpentered, and built the shanty, the mother and the daughters spun, and the boys as they grew up helped the father, unless they became peddlers like Huntington and grew rich by the merchant's process of selling both purchaser and goods. So long as they remained at home they could do the work among themselves.

The individualistic farmer was self-supporting, and consequently was exposed to all the evils that beset the beasts of the jungle. Those farmers alternated between a feast and a fast; in cases of drought or a failure in the crops, they had to suffer prolonged hunger. The work of these people was arduous and continuous; there was little time for educational development.

The histories of New England people, as written by Massachusetts writers themselves, picture the old-time intellectual expansion at a very low level. The songs they sang, the kind of music they performed, etc., etc., are all very suggestive. I suggest that literature to you for your edification. It was a low level of intellectuality, of course above a certain minimum. It told at all points of arduous, culture-nipping toil.

⁶ Material evolution worked fast in this case. Inventive science soon made it possible to do what DeLeon mentions here. As science and technology held the possibility of perfecting a plane capable of transcontinental flights, so the social scene of today contains the requirements for Socialist reconstruction.

ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE

That changed by degrees with the introduction of the perfected machine, together with the increased productivity of cooperative labor that the improved system of production forced upon the people. The final aspect which the change brought on is that, today, no one man in the United States is any longer independent of all others. Today, no one city, county, or state is any longer independent of any other city, county, or state.

The Massachusetts weavers could not work if the miners in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and as far west as Kansas, did not dig for coal; and the miners of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, and Kansas could not work if the farmers did not produce grain; and the farmers could not do their work if the shoemakers of Massachusetts and other industrial centers did not furnish them with shoes; and none of them could exist if the great railroads of the country did not transport their products. Today there is absolute cooperation.

Now, under such a system of production there must be a central directing authority, a government. As Marx puts it, a single violinist can be his own director. He raps himself to order, he puts his violin to his shoulder and sets his music to suit himself; he plays fast or slow, loud or otherwise, and stops whenever it suits him; but if you want an orchestra, if you want to have that combination of tones that comes from cooperation and an even assortment of musical instruments; if you want the blending of the bass drum, the cornet, the cymbal, and the flute with those of the violoncello then you must have an orchestra director.

If you have not got a director, you may have a Louisiana Negro breakdown, or something of that sort, but you cannot have musical harmony.

Likewise in this productive system of today. It is a large orchestra of production. In order to conduct this productive orchestra there must be a central directing authority. Under such social conditions, the central directing authority, the government, is like the skin on a man's body.

The thought occurs to me that it is not only the capitalist politicians, professors, and pulpiteers who are anarchists. The quack advertisers also come under that category, intellectually. You may have noticed the advertisement of quack doctors, advising, for instance, the use of John Jones's Skin Ointment: "it will give you a beautiful complexion and remove all pimples."

True, it may remove the pimples from a certain spot of the body; but below the skin, it is as foul as ever and productive of fresh pimples. It is absurd to say that you can remove impurities in that way; and it is just as absurd to imagine that you can remove the modern ills that afflict a people merely by either changing its government or decapitating the government altogether.

The nerves and muscles and veins and bones, of which this modern orchestra of production is made up, are aching, and the disease manifests itself in the ugly pimples that crop up on the surface of the skin—the capitalist governments that reflect the conditions of society. The social nerves, muscles, veins and bones do not ache because they do not produce enough. They ache because they are drained of the wealth they pro-

duce. They ache because all the advantages of their cooperative labor flow, not to them, but to a social abscess that has shaped itself within the body social. That social abscess is the capitalist class. They ache because not only are the advantages that flow from cooperative labor turned away from them, but because these advantages are turned against them, straining them to the point of breeding nauseous impurities.

The mere change, or the mere abolition of the governmental pimple can, obviously, bring no improvement, whatever else it may do. False pretenses will not stand. Purity, no more than freedom, can come to a people from the outside. As those who would be free must themselves strike the blow, so must that social lever named "government," to be used to establish freedom and purity, evolve from within.

People who have the anarchist conception of government have not yet learned the lesson that every boy has learned who has climbed up a tree, and watched the eggs hatch in the bird's nest, and seen the wings and the feathers of the wings sprout out of the body itself, until the bird takes flight. That boy knows that wings could never stand the bird to fly with if fastened on from the outside. They must grow from within. They must be a structural limb of the body. So, at all points, with "government." [Applause.]

FIRST STEP: REVOLUTION IN THE MIND

Consequently, today, arrayed against the whole clerical and lay anarchistic conception of government, which, logically enough, produces such assassinations as the recent one in Buffalo, and to which such idiotic campaigns as the municipal campaign now on in New

York are closely akin—arrayed against the whole pack stands the Socialist Labor Party. [Applause.] It says to the workman: True enough, you must seek to capture the government; true enough, you must aim at the overthrow of the present government; but not as either a finality or a starter. The overthrow of the government you must aim at must be to the end of using the governmental power to perfect the revolution that must have preceded your conquest of the public powers. [Applause.] The initial revolution must be accomplished in your minds. You must have divorced yourselves from the habits of thought that have been used to your enslavement; you must have come to an understanding that you are the sole producers of all wealth. [Applause.] You must have been able to draw the logical conclusion that the capitalist class is a parasite on your backs. [Applause.] You must have raised yourselves to appreciate your high mission in the evolution of society, in that only the economic power of your class is able to abolish the slavery of the race. [Loud applause.] You must, in consequence, have first learned what use to make of the government, when gotten; to wit, to use it as a social lever with which to establish the Socialist Republic and install the government that our needs require and that civilization needs.⁷

⁷ De Leon delivered this address in 1901, before he had worked out the program of Socialist Industrial Unionism. The development of this program added new meaning to Marx's statement: "... the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." Four years later, in his "Socialist Reconstruction" address, De Leon stated that if Socialist candidates triumphed at the polls there would be nothing for them to do but "to adjourn themselves, on the spot, sine die. Their work would

Accordingly, the Socialist Labor Party says not to the workmen: Vote the Socialist Labor Party ticket. It explains to them why they should vote that ticket, and it adds: If you do not yet understand why, then, for heaven's sake, cast not your votes with us, because, when elected, the Socialist Labor Party, the government you shall have chosen, must, in order to be effective, be something, not outside, not separate and apart from you; it must be flesh of your flesh and bone of your bone; it must have *men* at its back. [Prolonged applause.]

There is a providential dispensation in what is going on. The question is often put in these days, whether perhaps this Czolgosz affair might not cause the vote of the Socialist Labor Party to go down. What of it? What would be the meaning of the vote's going down? It would simply mean that the men who leave the Party at this election voted for it at the last election when they were not fit for the ranks of the Socialist Labor Party. [Applause.] It would mean that in that part of the structure for the emancipation of our people which the Socialist Labor Party is rearing the ground had sagged. It would mean that the ground would have to be pounded harder to make a more solid foundation.

Yet all these things that happen are like sponges which the providential surgeon puts to the body to absorb the pus and all impurities that do not belong

be done by disbanding." Socialism would be established by the Socialist Industrial Union, which would be the successor to the capitalist social structure and the capitalist government. See "Socialist Reconstruction of Society" and "Industrial Unionism: Selected Editorials."

there. [Laughter.] If the shot of Czolgosz takes votes from us, those votes never belonged to us. [Applause.] If a freak political movement comes up and if anybody thinks he can make a short cut toward social revolution, let him try it and find out. He will come back to us, if he is worth having. [Applause.] If the Democratic party comes out with a plank to "smash the trust," and numbers of our previous voters go away toward them, I say, "Wayward brothers, go in peace,"

One thing however, the whole gamut of the anarchist organizations—clerical and lay—in the land cannot do, and that is to cause the banner of the Socialist Labor Party to be lowered one inch. [Loud and prolonged applause and cheers.] The Party will carry on its work of education despite anything that may happen. It carries on that work encouraged by the knowledge that it is making progress. It carries it on encouraged by the knowledge that the revolution is being perfected in the minds of hundreds and of thousands of men in the nation.

The Party carries on its work of education encouraged by the knowledge that some day, somehow, something is bound to rip. And then, at that crisis, when the people, who have allowed themselves to be misled from Mumbo Jumbo to Jumbo Mumbo, will be running around like chickens without heads, there will be one beacon light in the land burning as clear in that darkness as it is burning 'midst the clouds today; one beacon, whose steady light will serve as guide; whose tried firmness will inspire confidence, and whose rockribbed sides will serve as a natural point of rally from which to save civilization. [Prolonged cheers.]

In conclusion, let me place on record a cheering fact that may be gathered from amidst the present chaos of thought that the country is in. You have seen during the last two months all the forces of anarchism combining the great powers they wield to the end of exploiting the Buffalo tragedy. Their instinct guided them correctly. All the warring factions of capitalist society, whatever label—clerical or lay—they wore, joined in one common assault on the Socialist Labor Party. From Barnegat to Puget Sound they fanned the sparks of rowdyism in the land, and sought to incite the populace to deeds of violence against the Socialist Labor Party.

And yet, despite all the forces of this mighty onslaught, they failed. Here and there and yonder, breaches of the peace were perpetrated against the Party. But the instances were isolated; they were in no manner commensurate with the efforts put forth to bring them on.

What signifies this wondrous manifestation? Negative though its significance is, it discloses the cheering fact that a healthy undercurrent is animating our people; it discloses the cheering fact that the ruling forces of anarchism no longer command the unqualified confidence of the masses; it confirms the estimate that, as our America was the land in which the death-knell of feudalism was struck, so it will be here that the death-knell of capitalism will sound, and the birth chimes of the Socialist Republic will ring. [Prolonged cheers and applause.]

Questions

At the close of the address, the chairman of the meeting, Mr. James A. Bresnahan, opened the floor for questions, and passed the gavel to the speaker. The following questions were then put, and answered by the speaker:

Mr. Abraham Brownstein (Social Democrat). The speaker made a remark in one part of his lecture which, it seems to me, contradicts certain statements which he makes in another part of his lecture. In one part of his lecture the speaker remarked "that all those who do not quite understand the reason why they have to vote for the Socialist Labor Party ticket, for heaven's sake, let them not vote for it." Now I will ask him: What does the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance mean by forcing its members to vote for the candidates of the Socialist Labor Party, and if not, they are compelled to be thrown out of their job? Now supposing that a certain trade is organized in the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance,⁸ and a certain person does not believe in the doctrines of the Socialist Labor Party; he is naturally, according to the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, thrown out of that labor union, or is compelled to vote the Socialist Labor Party ticket.

⁸ The Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance was organized in 1895 and was shortly thereafter endorsed by the Socialist Labor Party. It openly adopted the goal of Socialism. In 1905 the ST&LA was merged in the newly organized Industrial Workers of the World.

The Speaker. I stated that when we address people for the Socialist Labor Party we tell them: "If you are not ready to accept our positions, for heaven's sake, don't vote our ticket." Now, he says, isn't this in contradiction to a certain position which he calls attention to, namely, his declaration that we compel people who are members of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance to vote our Socialist Labor Party ticket, or get out. I am delighted he has asked that question. It furnishes one more proof that whoever tries to assault the Socialist Labor Party position must begin by furnishing himself with convenient premises by making false statements. [Applause.]

The gentleman has quoted my words correctly, but he has falsified the constitution of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. There is no truth in the premises he has set up that we compel people in the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance to vote the Socialist Labor Party ticket. The charge, as made by the gentleman, is stale. It has been made often before from the same source, and it has been as often demonstrated to be false.

The position of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance is plain. It is this: In view of the fact that the labor fakers run the trade organizations for capitalist, and therefore corrupt, political purposes, have themselves elected and announced as "presidents" and "secretaries," and then appear on the capitalist political platforms as leaders in their bodies; in view of the fact that they try to get office in these trade organizations for the purpose of appearing to the politicians as having the membership of the unions in their pockets; in view of these well-known facts, the Socialist Trade

and Labor Alliance declares in its constitution that no officer (officer, mind you) of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance shall take any active part in any political party unless it is the Socialist Labor Party. [Great applause.] Hold on, I am not yet through with this chap. Mind you, the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance does not say even to the officers, "You must vote the Socialist Labor Party ticket." It does not even say to the officers, "You must be a member of the Socialist Labor Party." Not at all! The pledge amounts to saying to them: "We shall not allow you to officiate as candle-bearers for capitalist political parties by trafficking upon the prestige of your position as an officer of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance." We do not say that an officer must be active in politics for this, that, or the other party; we do not say that he shall be active for the Socialist Labor Party; but the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance does say that if he is at all active for any political party, then his activity must be for the Socialist Labor Party.

Now see the difference there is between saying to a man, "You shall not be an officer of this organization unless you pledge yourself that if you are at all active in any party that party must be the Socialist Labor Party," and compelling him to vote the Socialist Labor Party ticket if he desires to become a member of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, as the gentleman has falsely charged. It will be a cold day when any Kangaroo will catch the Socialist Labor Party in a contradiction. [Great applause.]

ECONOMIC ROOTS OF PROTESTANTISM

Dr. Harriet Lothrop. How about the history of

the Protestant Revolution helping to illustrate the subject of today's address?

The Speaker: I am glad to be reminded of that. The Protestant Revolution had no chance of making headway until the guild-masters had succeeded very materially in stripping their apprentices of very many of their privileges, which prevailed under the feudal system, and were safeguarded by the Roman Catholic Church. Each trade was formed into a guild, and every guild was under the guild-master, who took apprentices. These apprentices were treated as "gentlemen's sons." They learned the master's trade; they ate at his table, they enjoyed with him all the holidays of the Roman Catholic Church, of which there are fully one hundred a year; not infrequently, they wound up by marrying the master's daughters.

Under that system the guild-master could not exploit his apprentices. Capitalism had no show. He began by chopping off their privileges, one after the other, until the apprentice sank to the level of a menial, and was relegated to the cook. In Dickens' "Barnaby Rudge" you will get a fair picture of this stage in the apprentice system. In the popular ballads of the period the apprentices complained that formerly they used to eat turkey, whereas now they never tasted the bird; that whereas formerly they were given "wine to drink, they had now to drink bilge-water."

The guild-master having thus squeezed the apprentices down—both in starving them and in knocking more work out of them by taking away from them one holiday after the other—grew wealthier. He was the capitalist in embryo. Before that, and during the early stages of this development, there were numerous

"uprisings" against the "Red Harlot," as the Protestants styled the Roman Catholic Church. But these uprisings, on the Continent and in England, all came to naught, bloodily so. It was not until the guild-masters had made sufficient progress on the lines of exploiting their apprentices, and had taken away almost all the Roman Catholic festivals from them; it was not until the point was reached when the guild-masters' interests were, accordingly, arrayed against the interests of the Roman Catholic hierarchy; it was not until then that there was an economic, material foundation for the alleged religious movement named "Protestantism."

The guild-masters were, of course, Protestants. A revolution had been accomplished in the ranks of the people. And thereupon Protestantism won out. The connecting point between this subject and the subject of this afternoon's address is that the anarchists on the theological field, especially the professional atheists, imagine religions, meaning creeds, can be set up, changed or overthrown by cashiering parsons, priests, or rabbis. They have failed to learn the lesson taught by Socialism upon the relation there is between society and "government," and learned by Socialism from the histories of creeds, the Protestant creed among the latest.

TRANSFORMATION OF A PRAYER

Another, perhaps still more comprehensive, illustration may be quoted. It is furnished by the Jews. The greatest prayer the Jews have, and the most remarkable prayer, at that, is not a prayer directed from man to God. It is a prayer directed from man to man. In that prayer they say: "Hear, oh Israel," do not do

this bad thing or that bad thing; do this and that good thing, etc. To what end? To the end that they may soon go to heaven? Oh, no! To the end that they may live long on this earth. And no wonder; that prayer, when originally gotten up, had a broad economic foundation.

At that time the Mosaic laws controlled, and under that system there was to be every five years a Jubilee; there were other larger Jubilees, and there was to be every fifty years a Grand Jubilee. At that Grand Jubilee, there was to be a complete readjustment of property. These Jubilees were a sort of vast and comprehensive bankruptcy law. Under that system there was a guarantee against perpetual and hereditary want. Accordingly, the Jewish people did not pray that they might die and go to heaven. In that prayer of theirs they admonished one another to behave well in order that they might live long.

But when, despite all the Jubilees, the Roman legions came along, and mowed down men, gathered in all the wealth they produced, and carried it back with them to Rome; when that Roman patrician class turned the world into a Valley of Tears, then people turned their eyes toward heaven as an asylum. With that changed social order, a changed order of prayers arose; then the "Lord's Prayer" made its appearance; then sprang up a new creed, the Roman Catholic creed, adapted to then existing social conditions. [Great applause.]⁹

Ferdinand Lassalle, a thinker of deep penetration,

⁹ This point is developed in Gustav Bang's "Crises in European History," published by New York Labor News Co.

indicates that the Roman Catholic Curia itself is well aware of the historic foundation of its creed. In a magnificent passage of his great drama, entitled "Franz von Sickingen," he introduces a dialogue between two dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Curia, one of whom, a Cardinal-Legate, observes that the danger lay, not in Luther, but in Erasmus and Reuchlin, who were awakening in the people a taste for a paradise on earth. He understood that the danger lay in economic conditions, backed by teachings, that should induce man to pray to God to keep him as long as possible away from heaven, so that he might enjoy the certain pleasures of a terrestrial paradise. [Applause and laughter.]¹⁰

Mr. Rizmann (Social Democrat). My question is that upon the theory that has been expressed this afternoon, that by killing the head of an organization it does not say that the organization itself is killed. Yet in the ancient history which we have heard today it is entirely different [laughter], and then the conclusion leads to that. [Laughter.] The speaker has mentioned that when you kill the Editor of the Socialist Labor Party paper, thereby you have also killed the Socialist Labor Party, because—[Laughter, and cries of "Sit down."] I understood that the speaker said, that by killing the Editor of the Socialist Labor paper in some way, you may just as well kill the Socialist Labor Party. [Several voices: "Sit down." Laughter.] I understood

¹⁰ In the Lassalle drama, the Cardinal complains of the "spirit of the now and here on earth," of the inspiration of a nobler mankind in the breasts of those who had been satisfied with a promise of the hereafter. He warns that humanism and science were raising "an evangel of man"; that is, concern for what happens on earth and for the betterment of man's lot.

that the speaker said that. I wanted the speaker to explain how he contradicts himself in that by saying that today to kill the president of an organization does not affect the organization, and yet at the same time he mentions that by killing the Editor of the Socialist Labor paper you kill the Socialist Labor Party. [Laughter.]

The Speaker. Every man or woman present who heard me say what this man says I said, let him raise his right hand. [No hand was raised.] Now all those who know that he is falsely stating what I said, please raise your hands. [Practically all the hands were raised.] This question also illustrates what kind of people rise up, with malice marked on their faces, against the Socialist Labor Party. One of them misquotes a printed statement, another has the impudence to declare, in your very presence, that I said things here which are just the reverse of what I did say. Your question has been answered by the audience. You will take your seat, sir. [Applause.]

Mr. Fred J. Boyle. The attitude of the Socialist Labor Party is well known on the armory question. Now, if a member of the Socialist Labor Party were elected to the city council of a city, and the question should come up of making an appropriation of \$15,000 for the police, what would be the attitude of the Socialist Labor Party on that question?

The Speaker. I do not know whether all of you are informed on what, no doubt, is back of this question. Let me, therefore, state what I consider the source of this gentleman's question to be before I answer it.

In Haverhill [Massachusetts], a man by the name

of James Carey, a Social Democrat [Laughter. Applause from one person.]—that solitary handclap is a good illustration of the popularity of Mr. Carey outside of a Democratic party crowd. [Laughter and applause.] Now then, the person who has the intense admiration of that lone man in this hall, voted for a \$15,000 appropriation for an armory in the city of Haverhill. Thereupon the Socialist Labor Party pitched him, and has never let up.

He first "explained," saying that unless he voted as he did he would have been punished by the state laws. That was shown to be false.

Then he "explained," saying that, if he had not done as he did, the city of Haverhill would have been liable to a fine. That false pretense was also knocked down.

Then he "explained," saying that it was necessary that the appropriation should be made as a sanitary measure, for the old armory, he said, was in an unsanitary condition. That crook's "explanation" was also knocked down by showing that if the bullets that killed workmen on strike were sanitary bullets, they were not any less deadly, and in the capitalists' interest, than the unsanitary ones. [Laughter.]

Thereupon that paragon of duplicity and treason to the workers, after several other contortions, resorted to this, his latest "explanation": "Look," said he, "at the Social Democracy in Germany; see how the Social Democracy in Germany votes for appropriations for the sanitation of the German Army, and shall not I, a genuine Social Democrat, vote for appropriations for the sanitation of an American armory?" [Laughter.]

In other words, he dared no longer to lie; he now started to insinuate a lie. The lie here insinuated is that there is any point of comparison between the German Army and the American militia, between the American militia, made up of young whippersnappers, mostly sons of capitalists, who go into it for fun and for the purpose of killing strikers when they turn out, and a body like the German Army, which every man is compelled to join, and the majority of whom are workmen. In the latter case the men are supported by that Army; they are taken from their trades and occupations and homes for three or four years, and of course it is necessary that the barracks in which they live shall be kept in a sanitary condition. But here, especially with the militia, it is quite different. Here we have a lot of youngsters who go into the militia, not because they are compelled to; the regiment does not give them a penny; it costs them money to keep it up, or keep themselves in it. There is no comparison between the two. Of course, we cannot favor appropriations for such purposes as that. [Applause.]

Now, by the light of this explanation, we can approach the question of appropriations for police. Nineteenths of the policeman's work consists in protecting the property in the hands of those who have it; that is, the capitalist class, the robber class. That robber class has its property, not by reason of its having worked for it, but by reason of its holding the instruments of production, which enable it to sponge up the wealth produced by the workman.

But the policemen have other duties besides protecting the capitalist class in the possession of its stolen property. They have to stand on the streets, and pre-

vent blockades, and answer questions, and similar duties. The policeman there exercises a social function that large aggregations of people render necessary. In Boston, I suppose there are certain streets where policemen have to be placed in order to prevent blockades and to make passing safe.

In New York there are many such streets. For instance, in the neighborhood of City Hall in New York there are three or four streets on which two policemen must be stationed on both sides of the street. Those thoroughfares are crowded with numerous trolley lines and other vehicles of traffic. People would be killed right along if policemen were not stationed there all the time, to give the signal to vehicles when to stop or when to proceed, and protect foot-passengers. That is a social function. The whole of New York is represented there by that work.

Now, the question is: What would the Socialist in office do under those circumstances in matters of appropriations? I should say that, under those circumstances, the Socialist would look carefully into all the circumstances and see what the money is to be expended for. If the appropriation is demanded in order to put that policeman in proper woolen clothing during cold weather and proper thin clothing during warm, in order that he may be protected properly from the weather while fulfilling that useful social function, then I should say it would be the bounden duty of all Socialists to vote for such an appropriation.

If, however, the appropriation is demanded for the purpose of furnishing the police with a certain kind of brass buttons for their coats, those brass buttons to be bought of a certain patentee, the wife of a cer-

tain gentleman who is a factotum of a Republican leader [this actually happened recently in New York], then the Socialist Labor Party would vote NO. [Applause.]

Again, if the appropriation is to give the policemen night billies or "riot" billies—that is to say, to arm them against workmen on strike—then it would be the duty of the Socialist Labor Party to vote NO, and NO forevermore. [Applause.]

Mr. A.H. Simpson (anarchist). I would like to ask the speaker whether there are not high anarchist authorities who would agree with the speaker that government is an outgrowth of conditions, and that education would be a means of extirpating that form of government? And I would like to ask the question, if he will not favor us with two definitions, one socialistic and one anarchistic?

The Speaker. The last part of the question shows to me that the gentleman has missed all I said about "government" as understood by Socialism. I certainly shall not attempt to give a coherent definition of what anarchists understand under "government." Their own utterances on the subject are too incoherent for that. They run all the way from the Ben Tucker¹¹ notion of a chairman with autocratic powers, and from whose decision there is no appeal, to the vagaries and mysticisms of a headless body. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. W.H. Carroll. I have here a copy of the Constitution and By-Laws of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. I would like to ask the speaker to read

¹¹ Benjamin R. Tucker (1854-1939) was a "Yankee anarchist" and pacifist.

the portion which shows that it is false to claim one must vote for the Socialist Labor Party to be a member of the Alliance.

The Speaker. The passage in question is found in Section 3 of Article 10 of the Constitution of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance of the United States and Canada. It is as follows [reading]:

Every general officer, every member of the General Executive Board, every officer of an affiliated organization, and every delegate to a national trade alliance, a district alliance, or convention of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, shall, upon entering his functions, take the following pledge, which shall be read to him and subscribed by him:

"I regard it as a sacred duty of every laboring man, and especially of anyone who is trusted by his fellow wage workers with a mission or position in the class struggle, to sever his affiliation, direct or indirect, with political parties of the capitalist class. I solemnly pledge my word and honor that I shall obey the constitution, rules and regulations of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance of the United States and Canada, and that, keeping always in view its fundamental principles and final aims, I shall to the best of my ability perform the task assigned to me."

Mr. Abraham Brownstein (Social Democrat). I want to ask another—

The Speaker [rapping to order]. You will take your seat, sir. I refuse you the floor. You have abused the courtesy of the floor when it was extended to you as the first questioner, by endeavoring to insinuate into the minds of this audience a false notion with regard to the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance constitution. That was a discourtesy to this audience. [Applause.] It may not be the least of the tasks before the Socialist Labor Party to teach such as you the elemental principles of propriety in public assemblages. You will take your seat, sir. [Loud applause.]

Mr. John F. Coyle. Did not George D. Herron

preside at a meeting in New York at which the Russian anarchist Prince Kropotkin spoke?

The Speaker. I don't know. So many things happen with the Rev. Social Democrat Herron. [Laughter.] He has been flitting around, here, there and everywhere. He posed as a great hero, ready to suffer martyrdom, when the heroism consisted in dropping a poor wife, and the martyrdom consisted in taking up a rich one. Now that, owing to the use the capitalists are making of the Czolgosz incident, the Socialists are called upon to show their mettle, the Rev. hero is off to Egypt to inspect mummies. I don't know whether he presided at that anarchist meeting in New York. But I know this about the Social Democrats in New York: In that city there was a notorious anarchist, Justus Schwab by name, a flannel-mouthed ranter. He died early this year. Social Democrats were foremost among those who did him honor. The funeral orator was a Social Democrat, one Alexander Jonas, who is on the staff of the German Social Democratic organ, the *Volkszeitung*. In the course of that funeral oration the Social Democrat Jonas eulogized the anarchist Schwab, and apostrophized him: "Thou art a hero."¹²

Mr. A.H. Simpson (anarchist). Can you tell us when you ever heard Schwab make a speech? To my

¹² The exact language used was: "When a learned man dies, whose significance escapes the masses, but who greatly benefited the world, then it may happen to be necessary to call attention to his merits. That, however, is not the case at the bier of Justus Schwab. Everyone in New York, aye, everyone in the whole United States, knew him, knew who Justus Schwab was. Despite the vilifications and the slanders of the capitalist press, the picture of Justus Schwab penetrated through, and it stands, today, illumined as that of a hero of freedom."—New Yorker "*Volkszeitung*," December 21, 1900.

personal knowledge Schwab has been too weak to speak for the past five years, and has been a physical wreck. Now I ask you where you have heard him make a speech. He has been for five years too weak even to be heard in conversation.

The Speaker. To your "personal knowledge," eh? Well, you are mistaken when you say Schwab has been for five years too weak to be heard even in conversation. During the months of January to June, 1899—that is not five years ago—Schwab was one of the leading shouters during the series of protracted sessions that took place in the *Volkszeitung* Corporation meetings, when the Schwab crew, mostly now Kangaroo Social Democrats, were trying to dictate to the Socialist Labor Party what policy it should adopt and how to conduct its own paper. I was present at those meetings. Spoke there. Had to speak in German. That was quite enough of a task upon my jaws. Now then, your Schwab, who you say was too weak to be heard in conversation for the past five years, made my task harder by constant interruptions and shouting at me. His voice was so far from being a "whisper" that I was constrained to turn on him at last, and, addressing him as a "lager beer anarchist," bid him keep order. [Laughter and applause.]

ARE TWO SOCIALIST PARTIES POSSIBLE?

Mr. Frank B. Jordan. I would like to ask if it is an utter impossibility that there should be two Socialist parties in one nation.

The Speaker. Your question is too broad. It is not an impossibility in a country like France, where there is no such thing as a national election in our sense. For

instance. In Lille there may be an election, and one in Nantes. But the candidates set up in Nantes are never voted for in Lille, and vice versa. Thus there may be a Socialist party in one place, and another Socialist party in another, wholly disconnected from each other's organization. The same thing holds good in Germany, Spain, etc. In none of those countries is a candidate ever run with the whole country as a constituency.

But that is not so in the United States. In the United States if there were two Socialist parties they would come into conflict necessarily every four years, at every Presidential election. My answer, therefore, is that, in the abstract, it is possible in countries where there is no national constituency; it is not here in the United States. I shall go further, however, and say there are not in the United States two Socialist parties; there is but one—the Socialist Labor Party. [Applause.]

A voice (no name). There are several people who are asking about the Socialist Labor Party as to just what it means, and they ask if the Socialist Labor Party works on the first command of God: "Love your neighbor as yourself."

The Speaker. I do not know just what this gentleman is trying to get at. If he means whether the Socialist Labor Party works on the principle of common politeness between man and man, and aims at the betterment of the race, that goes without saying. For the rest, the Socialist Labor Party has its feet planted upon the earth; its feet are not in the clouds, with its head down in the dirt. [Laughter and applause.]

ANARCHISTS' CONCEPTS OF "FREEDOM"

Mr. A. H. Simpson (anarchist). I would like just

to put a question, in fairness, in answer to the gentleman. The socialistic theory is that the means of production, the instruments of production, should be in the hands of the people. Otherwise it is impossible to prevent exploitation of the people. Now I want to know if that is not precisely the anarchistic doctrine as taught by Kropotkin, Reclus, and Malatesta? I mention them because these three anarchists have preached that exact doctrine. I wish to know whether you do not think that Kropotkin, Reclus and Malatesta teach those doctrines as absolutely as you and Marx do? In other words, I want to know if the difference between you and them is not the difference of political wire-pulling, and not of principle? I wish to have you answer that question for the benefit of some anarchists who are present—whether the Communism of Karl Marx is not laid out in Kropotkin and other anarchists? And we are under the impression that it is.

The Speaker. The question is this: Do not the theories of Reclus, Malatesta and Kropotkin embody the economics and doctrines of Socialism? And, further, whether the difference is not rather one of tactics—I would rather call it "tactics" than "wire-pulling." My answer is: It is quite likely, nay, it is a fact, that anarchists quite frequently crib Socialism; but in the same breath they fly off the handle with theories that positively fly in the face of the Socialist theories they had just proclaimed. In that they illustrate the felicitousness of the name they have given themselves; they bring themselves within the dictionary meaning of anarchy—disorder.

As to Elisee Reclus, no one who knows what he is talking about will charge him with being a responsible

man on economics or sociology. Reclus was a lovely character and an eminent geographer.

As to [Errico] Malatesta, the least said of him the better.

And now, as to [Prince Peter] Kropotkin. He was recently in New York; delivered an address there. The DAILY PEOPLE [April 2, 1901] had an article on the subject. The article placed two passages from that speech—one a Socialist, the other an anarchist—in juxtaposition. The two passages were at fistcuffs. The anarchist lacks the sense of synthesis.

Sticking to Reclus and Kropotkin, whether or not they desired to abolish exploitation of the people cuts no figure in determining the quality of anarchy. When Caesar was assassinated, it was done to the tune of "freedom," and to the tune of "freedom" did the avengers of Caesar slay his slayers.

Forty years ago, I venture to say, it would have been hard to find anywhere north of the Mason and Dixon line a Republican ready to do justice to Jefferson Davis' abstract sincerity. Jefferson Davis wanted freedom. Lincoln wanted freedom. Today Jefferson Davis stands vindicated on the score of his sincerity. But the freedom Davis wanted was a very different thing from the freedom that Lincoln wanted. The difference was brought out, not by talking for "freedom," or talking of "what is freedom," but by dealing with the question of how to bring that freedom about. The method to bring about the freedom which Davis wanted could not bring about the freedom that Lincoln's party was after. Consequently, it made no difference what name Davis, however sincere, gave to the freedom he was after. It was put down.

Likewise with all those people—the Recluses and Kropotkins included—who talk about “freeing the people,” “improving the people’s condition,” etc., and who seek to establish the point of contact between the concrete propositions of anarchists and those of Socialism, on the ground that “both want the same ultimate end.” That conclusion is an assumption. The historic instances just quoted prove it.

Who would not wish for human happiness? The question is not whether they are one as to ultimate wishes. The question is *how* do they propose to realize their wishes?

Take two trees—a pear tree and a crab-apple tree. Plant them two yards from each other. They both draw up nourishment from the same soil; they both live in the same sun; they both breathe in the same air; the same wind blows upon both; and yet upon the one tree you will see growing a splendid Bartlett pear, and upon the other you will find crab apples. What is it that produces such a vast difference in the fruits that have drawn identical sustenance? It is the structural make-up of the two trees: their organizations.

The crab-apple tree produces a crab apple, the pear tree can never produce a crab apple; he who wants a pear will not put up with the lingo of the crab apple. [Applause and laughter.] So it is with the structural composition of anarchism and Socialism. Whatever the anarchists’ language may be on the “exploitation of the people,” what determines the fruit of their tree is the structure of anarchy, its conception of society. Now the fruit evolved, or strained, through that structure, is not the fruit that Socialism is after. We do not want it. [Applause.]

Indeed, we do not want it. And that we are right in not wanting it is not merely a theoretic inference of the reasoning I just presented. That we are right in not wanting it may be judged from the difference of the attitude of capitalism toward anarchism and toward Socialism. Has anyone ever heard of the capitalist class cultivating Socialism? No! For Socialism they have the correct historic instinct that it will be their death.

But how about anarchism? The Illinois *Staats-Zeitung*, a capitalist paper of European experience, gave away the secret when it advised the capitalist State to cultivate the anarchist larvae as a means of destroying Socialism.¹³ Capitalism may at times be incommoded by anarchy, annoyed, irritated by it, as a restive broncho may irritate its master; but capitalism knows its rule has nothing to fear from anarchy, that the ax that will behead the tyrant capitalism is held in the powerful grasp of Socialism. [Great applause and cheers.]

¹³ The following is a faithful rendition in English of the language of the Illinois “Staats-Zeitung”: “We have always been of the opinion that it takes the devil to drive out Beelzebub with, that Socialism must be fought with anarchy. The same as the corn louse and similar insects are driven out by setting against them other insects that devour them and their eggs, so should the State cultivate and rear anarchists in the principal nests of Socialism, and leave to the anarchists the work of destroying Socialism. The anarchists will do the work more effectively than either police or district attorneys.”

The Police and the Anarchists

By PAUL LAFARGUE

The capitalist class, incapable of defending its riches as it is incapable of acquiring them by labor, is the first class of the propertied which has made of the police the most solid pillar of its State and society. Without haggling or counting the cost it spends money for that purpose; it covers all the blind and unlawful brutalities of the police with the mantle of Christian charity; indeed it even gives them a certain satisfaction when, now and then, one of their own members is handled rather roughly by the "eyes of the law," because that gives them a foretaste of the treatment meted out to poor devils and Socialists who have the misfortune to fall into the heavy and often unclean hands of the police.

A POLICE PREFECT CONFESSES

The police, treated like a pampered, spoiled child, imagine that it is permitted to do almost anything. And it was thus that it took the liberty of introducing anarchism into France in order to set it against Socialism, because it was amusing to put the fear of God in the hearts of the good citizens. A former prefect of police, M. Andrieux, in his memoirs garrulously revealed that the police furnished the money needed for the foundation of the first anarchist paper published in France, which for the information of all and sundry published recipes for the manufacture of explosives and bombs. M. Andrieux revealed, further-

more, that the first anarchist "*attentat*" [attempt at assassination], the one directed against the Statue of Thiers, was set on foot with the knowledge and aid of the police. But in the eyes of the capitalists the police is so sublime and sacrosanct an institution that whatever it may do can never be bad. Not only did M. Andrieux remain entirely unmolested, although by his own confession he had organized anarchist plots, but no one in the government or the "loyal" press even faintly reproached him for having done so. The most they did was to regret his ruthless revelations. The bourgeois papers have always exhibited a certain fondness, not to say tenderness, for the anarchists, and they always encouraged their attacks upon the Socialists. Only last year the *Figaro* gloatingly published a long polemic screed of the anarchist Cohen against Bebel, Liebknecht and the entire German Social Democracy. On the side it may be observed that the paper most liberally paid M. Cohen for his slanders.

The police had entertained the comfortable illusion that it could hold the anarchists in leash at its pleasure. The intention was to use them solely against the Socialists, to hinder the agitation of the latter, disperse their meetings, to invade the editorial offices of Socialist papers arms in hand and to treat their editors with knives and revolvers. So long as the anarchists stuck to that role, working in the service of social reaction, they remained unmolested. The police had orders by no means to interfere when a band of anarchists assailed a Socialist, even if the latter happened to be a municipal councilor. The present Deputy Rouanet, for instance, who formerly was a municipal councilor in

Paris, was attacked by a gang of anarchists under the leadership of the stool pigeon Martinet, and was knocked down and kicked. The policemen who witnessed the scene permitted the assault and went their way, declaring with lofty, philosophic calm that "the gentlemen should settle the matter among themselves."

THE ANARCHISTS TAKE TOO MUCH FOR GRANTED

This so Christian tolerance of the police made the anarchists bold. They began thereupon to translate their individualistic theories about property into practice, plundered show windows and stores, broke into the houses of rich bourgeois and cleaned them out and, if they met with resistance, resorted to knife and revolver. The capitalists did not want to put up with that kind of theft. It looked rather too barbarous to them. The police was therefore faced by the necessity of arresting its hand-fed anarchist boys and arraigning them in the courts. The judges then had no choice but to sentence them just like common thieves and murderers. But such procedure produced a deep moral indignation among the "comrades"; and they went after the judges as though they had been Social Democrats. The anarchist appetite having been thus stimulated, they aimed higher: Vaillant threw his bomb into the Chamber of Deputies and Caserio assassinated Carnot.¹

The police, having been encouraged by ministers and politicians to use the anarchists against the Socialists, did not lose its nice equipoise when the knights of the dagger and bomb had robbed private persons, and sent judges and witnesses for the prosecution from

¹Marie Francois Sadi Carnot, fourth President of the French Republic.

this into a better world. But the police found that the joke had been carried too far when the anarchists menaced also the lives of politicians. The Deputies, trembling with fear, demanded anti-anarchist laws and an increase of the police budgets. These gentlemen knew full well that the police, directly or indirectly, is involved as an accomplice in all these attempted murders which so terribly frighten the good bourgeois. Nevertheless, so deeply ingrained in them is the respect for this worthy institution that they dare not utter the slightest censure nor ask for an investigation of its actions. They were anxious not to incur its disfavor and, instead, sedulously endowed it with new prerogatives and privileges. With folded hands they supplicated that laudable institution to protect them against the dynamite and daggers of the anarchists.

Politicians and capitalist press organs, arm in arm, applauded the police when it let loose the anarchists in order to hamper Socialist agitation. The bourgeois papers took great pains to depict, in minute detail, the stormy scenes the anarchist "comrades" caused at Socialist meetings. Gleeefully they exclaimed: "Here you can see how the Socialists deal with one another." Eagerly they spread among the public the falsehood that between anarchism and Socialism there was no essential difference. Anarchism, they said, is the logical sequence of Socialism, the anarchists are courageous people who have the consistency to translate their theories into practice; the Socialists, however, are hypocritical, mendacious anarchists who, because of cowardice or ambition, dare not draw all the consequences of their theories. These tactics were not

without success, for during a long time a large part of the public held the Socialists responsible for the idiocies the anarchists uttered and for the crimes they committed.

ANARCHISM AND CAPITALIST INDIVIDUALISM ARE ALIKE

The Socialists endeavored to put an end to this ominous confusion, surreptitiously nurtured and maintained by the capitalist press. They proved that the anarchist theories were the result of the economic *laissez-faire*, *laissez-passer*,² the legitimate offspring of bourgeois individualism; that the anarchists would operate only through individual action, while the Socialists expected success only through the action of the organized proletariat; that the anarchists fulminated against the suffrage, while the Socialists utilized it in order to penetrate legislative and administrative bodies to the great terror of the bourgeois politicians; that the anarchists preached the propaganda of the deed and the murderous action of the autonomous individual, while the Socialists would sanction only the propaganda of the idea and disapproved of bloodthirsty speeches as much as of dynamite-filled cooking pots, because the thievery of the anarchists and their blindly brutal dynamite outrages would not aid in the solution of the social problem but, on the contrary, would retard it for the reason that they excited the indignation of all

²The full phrase, "*laissez faire et passer, le monde va de lui-meme*," may be translated, "let alone [do not interfere]; the world revolves of itself." As used by capitalism's really rugged individualists (as opposed to those who have learned that reforms pay off), the phrase means: no interference; absolutely uncontrolled industrial and commercial competition.

the efficient members of the proletariat. But the politicians figured with just that indignation so that the Socialists might be compromised in the eyes of public opinion and in the courts be sentenced as common criminals. When, in 1882, Guesde, Dormoy and Lafargue faced the Court of Sessions at Moulins, and were sentenced to six months' imprisonment, the prosecuting attorney of the Republic read to the court articles from an anarchist paper which had been founded with the money of the police.

This confusion of ideas about anarchism and Socialism, so hurtful to Socialist agitation, lasted long enough and would have lasted still longer had it not been for later outrages which clarified public opinion as to the true state of affairs. Facts which otherwise would have received no attention were drawn into a glaring light and became generally conspicuous. All the dynamite heroes, who either practiced or approved of the propaganda of the deed, professed implacable hatred against the best-known champions of Socialism; they abused them, called them "bellwethers" and "popes," just as the capitalists themselves called the same men "inciters," and even threatened well-known Socialists with death. The books from which the anarchists claim to have derived their hatred of bourgeois society had been written by savants and philosophers who enjoy great renown in the bourgeois world, such as Darwin, Haeckel and Herbert Spencer.³ Never did

³Herbert Spencer was the philosopher and propagandist of capitalist anarchy. He damned any interference with capitalism's operations and held that the hardships of capitalism were the "effort of nature" to get rid of the "unfit" among the

an anarchist quote Marx, Engels or any other Socialist writer. The modern theoreticians of anarchism, such as Elisee Reclus and Kropotkin, exhibit the same supreme contempt for the scientific achievements of Karl Marx as do the bourgeois political economists; in their sentimental, bombastic and forced dissertations not even his name is mentioned. If a certain doctrine could be held responsible that anarchism germinated and developed in the embittered minds of people who, in capitalist society, belong to the defeated and downtrodden, then it ought to be the biologic theory of the struggle for existence, which is but the counterpart and complement of the free competition theory of the political economists. The materialist conception of history of Marx and Engels has absolutely no connection with anarchism; it shows how the development of economic conditions, which govern man and society, proceeds and necessarily leads to Communism.

THE ANARCHISTS' FRIENDS WERE CAPITALISTS, NOT SOCIALISTS!

The police itself contributed to do away with the confusion of ideas it had so industriously maintained. On Jan. 1, of the current year [1895], a few weeks after Vaillant had thrown his bomb, the Minister of the Interior, Raynal, caused 2,000 arrests and dom-

capitalists and workers. The general capitalist acceptance of ruthlessly rugged individualism was so widespread, and Spencer's philosophical and propagandistic influence was so great, that even Darwin, on occasion, confused the "survival of the fittest" (Spencer's phrase) in a state of nature with survival—the good and bad fortune of capitalists, and the desperate plight of workers—in society. Ernst Heinrich Haeckel helped to initiate "social Darwinism," a misapplication of biology to society.

iciary searches to be made. The residences of all the known anarchists were suddenly and thoroughly gone through, and all the documents found were sequestered. The Minister of the Interior had hoped to dig up facts on the strength of which the impression could be created that a giant conspiracy existed in which the Socialists were also implicated. He imagined that among the documents seized there could or would be found letters and other writings of known Socialists, from which might be deduced intimate collaboration and secret connections between anarchists and Socialists.

M. Raynal experienced a cruel disappointment. Not even the most harmless letter of a Socialist was found in possession of the anarchists; but, on the contrary, all the letters of the anarchists were brimming over with abuse of and threats against Socialists. The raids of the police proved, clear and clear, that anarchists and Socialists in neither their private life nor in their public activity were in any way connected; but that, contrariwise, they faced each other as foes in every respect.

However, even if the efforts of the police to hang the anarchists to the coat tails of the Socialists suffered shipwreck, a discovery was made which compensated for the failure and which nobody had expected. Among the papers of the best-known anarchists were found letters from priests, stock exchange kings, dukes and other persons as prominent as they were reactionary. These letters contained expressions of thanks and advised of the remittance of money. It appeared that the syndicate of Paris brokers possessed a special fund for the support of the anarchists for the purpose of preventing a repetition of the pistol shot which the anarch-

ist Gallace a few years ago fired in the exchange. Anarchism had become a lucrative business and smart people exploited the terror inspired by the crimes of the fanatics. Sebastian Faure, formerly the clerk of a stockbroker, was the go-between who managed things for the brokers and anarchists. This circumstance explains perhaps the 500 franc notes which Faure so often changed, and which probably came from the "Fund for the Timely Prevention of Dynamite Accidents," because for years past nobody knew how Faure made his living. Thus the police had caught the bankers of the anarchists. Evidently, it gave publicity to its discoveries in order to clear itself of the charge of having supplied Vaillant with the 100 francs he had required for the manufacture of his bomb. At the trial, the judge inquired about the source of that 100 francs so cautiously and so forbearingly that the public did not hesitate to regard the charge as perfectly true.

ANARCHISTS' VIOLENCE JUSTIFIED BY CLERICAL POLITICIANS

Press and politicians assert that Socialism is the advance fruit of anarchism; one begins with being a collectivist and, if only logical, courageous and sincere enough, unfailingly winds up an adherent of dynamite. The assertion was not a happy one. A strange and unfortunate accident willed it that the anarchists who distinguished themselves through the propaganda of the idea and the propaganda of the deed almost without exception had been educated by clergymen.⁴

⁴See Daniel De Leon's analysis of this subject in "Socialism Versus Anarchism."

Sebastian Faure, the most phrase-mongering anarchist speaker, who held meetings throughout France at which he called for deeds of force with extraordinary vehemence, spent his youth in the priests' seminary in St. Etienne. After the death of his father, at the age of twenty-five, when he was about to be ordained a priest, he left it to enter upon a business career wherein he blew in the fortune of his wife. Despite his vociferous activity as an anarchist, he remained in close touch with the clergy, and in the cities where he agitated had confabs with the local priests.

Cyvoct, at present sojourning in a bagnio, belongs to the Catholic Union in Lyon; he was still a member of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul when he first appeared as an anarchist speaker. Ravachol and Vailant had had a religious upbringing. Caserio was conspicuous by his fervent piety. At the seminary where he spent his childhood he was called "il santo" (the saint), and up to his fifteenth year he functioned at mass as choir boy.

It is characteristic that among the many persons arrested for having openly approved of the assassination of Carnot, there was found not a single Socialist but there were some clergymen. One of them indulged in exalted praise of Caserio and expressed regret that he could not send him money. The clergy hated Carnot, whom they regarded as a freemason; on the very day of his death, the Catholic paper, *La Croix du Nord* (*The Cross of the North*), contained an article leveled at the President of the Republic, prophesying that "his earthly days were numbered."

At all times the church has maintained that it has

the right to judge and condemn kings and princes. In the middle ages it deposed potentates; the Jesuits placed the dagger in the hands of the murderers of Henry III and Henry IV of France; as Pascal has proved in his "*Lettres Provinciales*" ("Provincial Letters"), the most eminent savants defended the maxim "that one could wish for the death of persons who are about to persecute us," and, furthermore, the death of "persons who injure our goods and our honor, of false witnesses who testify against us, and of judges who unjustly sentence us."

Who knows but what these teachings are in some heads effective to this very day? At any rate, the works characterized by Pascal have never been condemned by the Pope. Moreover, does not the Old Testament glorify Judith because she gave herself up to the Assyrian general, Holofernes, made him drunk and then killed him? Who knows whether or not this tragic tale, which Caserio learned in his childhood, filled him with the courage to assassinate Carnot?

SOCIALIST INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

I

In a revolutionary period in history, when mankind must choose between an outworn social order and a new order, the question HOW becomes every bit as important as the question WHAT.

The great social question of our age which demands immediate solution is: Are we going to keep the system of *private* ownership of the *socially* operated industries? Shall we attempt to preserve a social system that has proved its incapacity to solve the problem of poverty in the midst of plenty? Shall we prolong the life of a society in which a few own all the means of wealth production, in which labor-saving machinery, instead of lightening labor's toil, throws workers out of their jobs on to the industrial scrap heap? Must mankind pass through endless vicious cycles of depression, crisis and war? Or shall we do the common-sense thing, make the means of production our collective property, abolish exploitation of the many by the few, and use our productive genius to create leisure and abundance for all in peace and freedom?

Once it is agreed that society must be reconstructed, then there are certain things we must understand. The first is that we can expect no help whatso-

ever from the beneficiaries of capitalism. Here and there a capitalist may see the handwriting on the wall and join with the workers, but as a class the capitalists, like the slave-owning and feudal classes before them, will strive to prolong their poverty-ridden, war-breeding system. The *workers* of hand and brain must build this new world and emancipate themselves through their own classconscious efforts.

The second thing we must understand is this: Though the workers are in the overwhelming majority, and have tremendous *potential* power, they can apply their collective strength to the task at hand only through *organization*.

How must the American workers organize to effect their emancipation?

We have a Constitution that provides for its own amendment, or, in other words, that legalizes revolution. In the language of Abraham Lincoln: "The right of peaceable assembly and petition and by Article V of the Constitution—the right of amendment—is the constitutional substitute for [armed] revolution."

This means that by organizing *politically* the working class places itself firmly upon the institutions of civilization, and avails itself fully of the constitutional right of political agitation and the ballot. This is the peaceful method. It permits the forces of progress to proclaim their purpose in the broad-open day, and there mobilize themselves for political victory and the conquest of the capitalist political State.

But no ruling class in history has ever willingly relinquished its power and privileges. There is nothing

in the history of our own ruling class to indicate that it differs in this respect from the slave-owning and feudal classes of old. Therefore, behind the Socialist ballot the workers must organize a power capable of enforcing its mandate. Socialist Industrial Unionism is that power. Unlike AFL-CIO unionism, which boasts of being a bulwark of capitalism, Socialist Industrial Unionism declares its intention to abolish class rule.

The source of all power is economic. Armies, particularly modern armies, cannot operate unless they are constantly supplied with a multitude of items which flow uninterruptedly from industry. Although an army is a military power, it is dependent on industry, hence *on the workers who operate industry*.

Modern capitalist production has achieved such magnitude that it has greatly expanded the potential economic power of the workers. This is true because the workers *run industry from top to bottom and are, therefore, in the best strategic position to take possession*. "Take possession" is precisely what we must do in an orderly and yet resolute manner the moment the victory at the polls is proclaimed. This is not a general strike that gets the workers out of the industries—the source of their power—and into the streets where they may be clubbed, gassed and shot, but a **GENERAL LOCKOUT OF THE CAPITALIST CLASS!**

Finally, the Socialist Industrial Union supplies the instrument for the administration of production under the Industrial Republic of Labor. It is at once "the

battering ram with which to pound down the fortress of capitalism, and the successor of the capitalist social structure itself."

II

The idea of Industrial Union Government is Daniel De Leon's crowning contribution to social science, and specifically to Socialism. He projected and developed the third "great plan of government," the Socialist Industrial Republic, which will replace the outmoded political State (government over men through territorial constituencies), and establish the Marxian "administration of things." This is the non-political government of democratic, industrial representation and administration.

It is important to note that Industrial Union Government is an entirely new concept of social administration. It implies an entirely new basis of representation. Instead of Senators and Representatives from states and congressional areas, it is based on industrial constituencies and functional representatives from the industries and social services. The qualifications of these representatives elected to the All-Industrial Union Congress will be a knowledge and understanding of the processes of production and distribution, ability to coordinate and direct these processes, and a dedication to the duties and responsibilities with which they are charged.

The workers who operate the industries today under capitalism will, of course, operate them under Socialism. Voting in the plants and shops, they will

elect their supervisors, administrative committees and representatives to local, departmental and national industrial councils, and, finally, to the All-Industrial Union Congress, representation, accordingly, being on an ascending scale, and not from the top down.

We do not presume to make a rigid blueprint of the Industrial Union Administration, provide details, or lay down arbitrary lines of demarcation. These will be the tasks of the free workers under Socialism. But the general outline is clearly defined in the *methods and processes of production itself*.

For a more complete treatment of this subject, the reader is referred to Daniel De Leon's great work, "Socialist Reconstruction of Society," and other Socialist Labor Party publications.

FIFTEEN QUESTIONS ABOUT SOCIALISM, by Daniel

De Leon (128 pp.—Price 60 cents, postpaid.) This pamphlet provides a "preview" of the economic operations of the Socialist society. It answers such questions as: How will the incomes of workers be determined under Socialism? The answers to the questions, which were proposed by a Catholic priest who sought to put the Socialists "on the spot," are an indictment of capitalism as well as a scientific exposition of Socialist economics.

ABOLITION OF POVERTY, by Daniel De Leon. (Price 35 cents postpaid.) The essays in this pamphlet were prompted by a Jesuit's attack on Socialism. In answering the attack, De Leon went deeply into the materialist conception of history and contrasted that conception's socially beneficent results with the anti-social results of the so-called idealist conception. "Abolition of Poverty" is one of the most important works of Socialist literature.

Prices subject to change; send for catalogue.

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS

116 Nassau St., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

P.O. Box 200, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11202

I am interested in Socialism. Please send me information and free literature published by the Socialist Labor Party, including sample copy of the WEEKLY PEOPLE, official organ of the Socialist Labor Party.

Name [Please print]

Address
(SVA-62) (May be pasted on post card)

MARXISM VS. SOVIET DESPOTISM

By Arnold Petersen

Discusses the impact of De Leon's ideas on Lenin; shows that aspects of "Leninism" are in conflict with Marx's principles; and exposes as utterly false the Kremlin's boast that there is Socialism in Russia. Includes an article by Arnold Petersen, written shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution, in which it was pointed out that Socialism could not triumph in a country as backward as Russia was in 1917. Events have fully vindicated this forecast.

56 pages—Price 25 cents postpaid

SOCIALIST LANDMARKS

By Daniel De Leon

This work is a systematic analysis of capitalism and of Socialism. It contains De Leon's famous addresses: "Reform or Revolution," "What Means This Strike?" "The Burning Question of Trades Unionism," and "Socialist Reconstruction of Society." (240 pages)

Price: \$2.25 clothbound; 75 cents paper covers; postpaid

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS

116 Nassau St., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

WEEKLY PEOPLE

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

Read the WEEKLY PEOPLE, official organ of the Socialist Labor Party, a paper of Revolutionary Socialism and Industrial Unionism. Rates: \$3 a year; \$1.50, six months.

WEEKLY PEOPLE

P.O. Box 200, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11202



No. 28